

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



By

JAN 11 2005

FILE:

WAC 00 133 53066

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:


IN RE:

Petitioner:

Beneficiary:


PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Multinational Executive or Manager Pursuant to
Section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.


Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, California Service Center, initially approved the employment-based visa petition. Upon review of the record, the director properly issued a notice of intent to revoke and ultimately revoked approval of the petition. The Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) dismissed a subsequently filed appeal. The matter is now before the AAO on a motion to reopen and reconsider. The motion will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an organization incorporated in the State of California in February 1996. It purports to develop real estate and import and export construction materials and related equipment. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as its president. Accordingly, the petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C), as a multinational executive or manager.

The director initially approved the petition on November 24, 2000. Upon review of the record, the director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary would be employed in a managerial or executive capacity for the United States entity. After properly issuing a notice of intent to revoke, the director revoked the approval of the petition on December 6, 2002. In a December 16, 2003 decision, the AAO affirmed the director's decision. The AAO also determined, beyond the decision of the director, that the petitioner had not established its ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage.

On the Form I-290B Notice of Appeal, filed on January 16, 2004, counsel for the petitioner indicated that a brief or further evidence would be submitted to the AAO in 30 days. To date, careful review of the record reveals no subsequent submission; all other documentation in the record predates the issuance of the notice of decision. Further, in order to properly file a motion, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) provides that the affected party must file the motion within 30 days of service of the unfavorable decision. If the decision was mailed, the motion must be filed within 33 days. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b). The failure to file before this period expires may be excused at the discretion of the AAO where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the petitioner. 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i). Counsel has not requested that a late-filed brief be excused and accepted as evidence in support of the petitioner's motion.

Counsel's statement on the Form I-290B reads:

The AAO improperly ignored and did not give appropriate weight to citations to cases supporting [the petitioner's] multinational manager or executive petition. The cases supported the petitioner's arguments that the number of employees and size of a company do not determine whether a position is an executive one or not. Furthermore the AAO improperly ruled on an issue not raised on appeal: the ability to pay the preferred wages. This issue was raised by neither the USCIS nor the petitioner. It was not a basis of the denial. The AAO therefore was without authority to review this issue. The AAO also ignored the higher burden placed on the USCIS in revoking a visa as established by precedent case law.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(2) states, in pertinent part: "A motion to reopen must state the new facts to be provided in the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence." Based on the plain meaning of "new," a new fact is found to be evidence that was not available and could not have been

discovered or presented in the previous proceeding. The petitioner has not submitted new facts supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Motions for the reopening of immigration proceedings are disfavored for the same reasons as are petitions for rehearing and motions for a new trial on the basis of newly discovered evidence. *INS v. Doherty*, 502 U.S. 314, 323 (1992)(citing *INS v. Abudu*, 485 U.S. 94 (1988)). A party seeking to reopen a proceeding bears a "heavy burden." *INS v. Abudu*, 485 U.S. at 110. With the current motion, the movant has not met that burden. The motion to reopen will be dismissed.

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(3) states, in pertinent part:

A motion to reconsider must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the decision was based on an incorrect application of law or Service policy. A motion to reconsider a decision on an application or petition must, when filed, also establish that the decision was incorrect based on the evidence of record at the time of the initial decision.

Neither counsel nor the petitioner has submitted any pertinent precedent decisions to establish that the AAO decision was based on an incorrect application of law or policy. First, the AAO reiterates that unpublished decisions are not binding on Citizenship and Immigration Services (CIS) in its administration of the Act. See 8 C.F.R. §103.3(c). Second, an application or petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied by the AAO even if the Service Center does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision. See *Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003); see also *Dor v. INS*, 891 F.2d 997, 1002 n. 9 (2d Cir. 1989)(noting that the AAO reviews appeals on a *de novo* basis). Third, Section 205 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1155, states: "The Attorney General may, at any time, for what he deems to be good and sufficient cause, revoke the approval of any petition approved by him under section 204."

Regarding the revocation on notice of an immigrant petition under section 205 of the Act, the Board of Immigration Appeals has stated:

In *Matter of Esteime*, . . . this Board stated that a notice of intention to revoke a visa petition is properly issued for "good and sufficient cause" where the evidence of record at the time the notice is issued, if unexplained and un rebutted, would warrant a denial of the visa petition based upon the petitioner's failure to meet his burden of proof. The decision to revoke will be sustained where the evidence of record at the time the decision is rendered, including any evidence or explanation submitted by the petitioner in rebuttal to the notice of intention to revoke, would warrant such denial.

Matter of Ho, 19 I&N Dec. 582, 590 (BIA 1988)(citing *Matter of Esteime*, 19 I&N 450 (BIA 1987)).

Counsel has not provided a proper basis to reconsider the previous decision and has ignored longstanding precedent decisions and the regulations pertinent to this visa classification.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden. The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(4) states: "[a] motion that does not meet applicable requirements shall be dismissed." Accordingly, the motion will be dismissed, the proceedings will not be reopened, and the previous decisions of the director and the AAO will not be disturbed.

ORDER: The motion is dismissed.